

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 are all the claims pending in the application.

The Examiner rejects:

- claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, due to allegedly non-enabled features recited therein;
- claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, due to allegedly indefinite recitation of the scope of the claim; and
- claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Masukane et al. (Masukane).

Also, the Examiner objects to the drawing because Figs. 1 and 3 allegedly require more description.

Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 3 and 6 more clearly to define the features recited therein. These amendments are merely for clarification purposes and do not narrow the scope of the original claims. No estoppel is created.

With regard to the objection to the drawing, Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting a telephonic interview with Applicant's representative on May 19, 2003. As discussed during the interview, Applicant's Figs. 1 and 3 include labels for all of the elements illustrated therein, and these labels are clearly described in the specification. As agreed during the interview, one skilled in the art would readily understand what is being illustrated by these figures. Therefore, as further agreed during the interview, the Examiner's objection to the drawings will be withdrawn.

The §112, second paragraph, rejection is believed to have been overcome by the amendments to claim 3 as set forth above.

With regard to the 112, first paragraph, rejection, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art of information display systems would readily appreciate that the term “back porch” and “front porch” are terms of art which describe portions of the waveform, as explained in, for example, U.S Patent 6,441,857 (cited by the Examiner) at col. 5, line 20 through line 46.

Likewise, one skilled in the art would readily appreciate that “a dot clock frequency” refers to a clock frequency calculated based on the horizontal (i.e., dot) resolution required to display an incoming signals. That is, in accordance with an aspect of the invention, as illustrated for example in Applicant’s Fig. 2:

The scaler 23 detects the sizes of the digital RGB signals (screen data) and the digital information data, and calculates a dot clock frequency, a horizontal synchronizing frequency, a vertical synchronizing frequency, a front porch, a back porch, a pulse width, in order that both of the digital RGB signals (screen data) and the digital information data can be displayed on the analog display 15 or the digital display 16, and controls the synchronization signal generator 24 based on the calculated values. (Applicant’s specification, page 6, lines 9-16).

Accordingly, the terminology recited in Applicant’s claim 2 is adequately described in, and fully enabled by, the specification, and would be readily understood by skilled artisans in the context of Applicant’s invention.

Therefore, the Examiner's §112, first and second paragraphs, rejections should be withdrawn.

With regard to the Examiner's prior art rejection, Applicant's claimed invention defines an information displaying system comprising a unique combination of features including, *inter alia*, a screen mixing means comprising:

- a first memory for storing said third digital RGB signals, and
- a second memory for storing digital information data inputted from a third input terminal,
- said screen mixing means
- detecting sizes of said third digital RGB signals and said digital information data,
- calculating designated control information,
- mixing said digital information data with said third digital RGB signals,
- generating a synchronization signal based on said designated control information,
- reading said third digital RGB signals from said first memory and said digital information data from said second memory based on said synchronization signal, and
- forming displaying data by mixing said third digital RGB signals read from said first memory and said digital information data read from said second memory,

so that said digital information data are displayed at outsides of a displaying region of said third digital RGB signals (Applicant's independent claim 1).

None of the prior art references discloses, teaches or suggests such a unique combination of features. In particular, Masukane (relied on by the Examiner) discloses video processing apparatus which converts one of NTSC type and VGA type video signals to the other, or

overlays the two types of video signals and outputs them as either an NTSC type overlaid video signal or a VGA type overlaid video signal. In this regard, Masukane has nothing to do with mixing digital information data and screen data (i.e., RGB signals). Thus, Masukane does not disclose, and is incapable of suggesting, a first memory for storing digital RGB signals and a second memory for storing digital information data, let alone screen mixing means for mixing digital information data with digital RGB signals, "so that said digital information data are displayed at outsides of a displaying region of said third digital RGB signals," as required by Applicant's independent claim 1.

The Examiner acknowledges that Masukane does not disclose displaying digital information data at outsides of a display region of digital RGB signals. However, the Examiner alleges that such an implementation would have been obvious in view of Matsukane's teachings with regard to image overlay. Applicant respectfully disagrees.


In fact, in contradistinction to Applicant's claimed information displaying system which displays digital information data at outsides of a displaying region of the digital RGB signals, Masukane discloses a video processing apparatus which overlays two types of video signals (NTSC and VGA) and displays them (as either an NTSC type overlaid video signal, or a VGA type overlaid video signal) in the same, single region. That is, Masukane does not display one of its two types of video signals "at outsides of a displaying region" of the other signals. Instead, Masukane overlays the two signals and displays them as a single overlaid signal in the same, single display region.

Thus, Applicant's independent claim 1, as well as its dependent claims 2-6 (which incorporate all the novel and unobvious features of its base claim) would not have been obvious from Masukane at least for these reasons.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Stan Torgovitsky  
Registration No. 43,958

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: July 9, 2003